

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Thus, Claims 1-12, 23 and 24 are pending in the present application. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found in the specification at page 36, lines 1-14; and page 24, line 6 to page 25, line 5. Thus, no new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1-12 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Office Action contends that the step of removing the template in claim 1, line 6 is indefinite, because it is unclear from what the template is removed. The Office Action then states that if the template is removed from the substrate and the metal oxide layer, it should be positively and clearly recited as such. Claim 1 as amended recites that the template is removed from the metal oxide later.

The Examiner also contends that the step of patterning in claim 2, line 3 lacks antecedent basis since there is no previous mention of patterning. Claim 1 as amended recites a patterning step, thus providing proper antecedent basis for recitation of “the patterning” as recited in amended claim 2.

In view of the comments presented above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Appl. No. : 10/840,192
Filed : May 6, 2004

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. If any minor issues remain which could be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 1/8/09

By: 
Neil S. Bartfeld, Ph.D.
Registration No. 39,901
Agent of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

6354168
121108